

Appl. No. 10/035,726  
Atty. Docket No. 8773  
Amdt. dated 09/24/2003  
Reply to Office Action of July 3, 2003  
Customer No. 27752

### REMARKS

Claim 1 is amended to require three die inlets instead of the two previously recited, wherein the inlets have a difference in inlet size, spacing from an adjacent inlet, and being arranged in banks having mutually different numbers of inlets. Antecedent basis is found in dependent Claims 5, 7 and 8. No new matter is added. Claim 5 is amended to ensure proper dependency. Claim 4 is amended in accordance with the Examiner's comments. Claim 10 is amended to more particularly recite the insert tube for admitting energy to the die cavity.

Claims 1-12 and 15-16 are rejected under 35 USC §102(b)-03 as anticipated by Hill et al. (2,803,041). Hill et al. teaches an extrusion apparatus having injection passages 24. The apertures 36 of the injection passages 24 are arranged in a spiral pattern around sleeve 32. The injection passages 24 are arranged in two parallel groups, each group having six equally-sized injection passages 24, wherein each injection passage 24 is equally spaced from the adjacent injection passage 24. While the Office Action argues the two groups of injection passages 24 comprise separate banks, the banks have a common injection point at sleeve 32, i.e., a helix axially aligned with sleeve 32.

However, the point is moot as the amendments made hereunder overcome either interpretation of Hill et al. Claim 1, with the amendments made hereunder, now recites inlets with differential inlet sizing. Such an arrangement provides the benefit that different kinds of material may be fed in different quantities, as the end product may require. Such an arrangement is not shown by Hill et al. Likewise, Claim 1 recites inlets being arranged in plural banks wherein different banks have mutually different numbers of inlets. Again, this provides the benefit that materials may be admitted to the die in accordance with the quantities that are optimally desired for the end use. Finally, Claim 1 recites inlets having differential spacings from adjacent inlets. This provides the benefit that certain materials may be kept apart for a longer period during the extrusion process, preventing dilatorious interaction, and possibly premature curing, of those materials during the extrusion process. The invention of and benefits of Claim 1 are not found in Hill et al.


The Office Action does not cite Claims 13-14 as being rejected. Claims 13-14 recite a die having insert tubes transparent to the transmission of energy therethrough. Claim 10 has been amended to require the insert tubes to admit energy to the die cavity without admitting material to the die cavity. This amendment is believed to overcome and be distinguishable from the references of record.

Appl. No. 10/035,726  
Atty. Docket No. 8773  
Amdt. dated 09/24/2003  
Reply to Office Action of July 3, 2003  
Customer No. 27752

Claims 1-17 are provisionally rejected for double patenting over Claims 1-20 of copending Application Ser. No. 10/035,720 in view of Hill et al. A terminal disclaimer is enclosed herewith. This is believed to overcome the double patenting rejection. All matters raised by the Office Action are believed to be addressed by the amendments made hereunder. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and allow all claims remaining in the application.

Respectfully submitted,

By

  
Larry L. Huston  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
Registration No. 32,994  
(513) 634-9358

Sept 24, 2003  
Customer No. 27752